

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By the present remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that that the rejections of the November 14, 2007 Office Action have been overcome, and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Summary of the Official Office Action

The Office Action rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over RFC 2462 in view of RFC 3041.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is allowable over the cited art, and an indication of allowability of the present application is therefore respectfully requested.

Traversal of Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In re Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, according to the Office Action, it is unclear how the identification data corresponds to the network

address. Additionally, the Office Action rejected Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16 as being incomplete for omitting essential steps with the omission amounting to gap between the steps.

The Office Action presents steps believed to be essential to the invention. The steps offered by the Office Action are not essential and are unduly narrowing. A claim may be broader than the specific **embodiment** disclosed in a specification and still be definite. In re Gardner, 480 F.2d 879, 178 USPQ 149,149 (C.C.P.A 1973). Although embodiments are described with detail in the specification, the claims as amended, are definite and include all necessary steps to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 at the Examiner's earliest convenience

Traversal of Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In re Claims 1-18

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 1-18 as being unpatentable over RFC 2462 in view of RFC 3041 because each and every feature of the present invention is not taught, suggested, or disclosed in any of the references alone or in any permissible combination.

Let us hypothetically assume that the combination of the RFC 2462 and 3041 references is proper, which the Applicant disputes. Applicant respectfully

submits that the combination still does not teach or suggest any embodiment where a **determination** is made as to whether a **network address conforms** with identification data specific to a device, as recited in Independent Claim 1.

As amended, independent Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, . . . “**determining** whether the **network address conforms to the identification data** and sending a message preventing the device from using the network address based on the determination.”

Applicant respectfully submits that either reference, alone or in combination, fails to disclose at least the above-mentioned features of the present invention.

RFC 2462 is seen to describe how a host autoconfigures its interfaces in IPv6 (abstract, page 1). This includes creating a link-local address and verifying its uniqueness on a link, determining what information should be autoconfigured, and whether they should be obtained through a stateless or stateful mechanism (abstract, page 1). RFC 2462 provides no teaching or suggestion of determining whether a network address conforms to the identification data of a specific device as recited in independent Claim 1.

RFC 3041 is seen to describe an extension to IPv6’s stateless address autoconfiguration (abstract, page 1). The extension described causes nodes to generate global-scope addresses from interface identifiers that change over time (section 1, page 2). Additionally, it describes that through extended use of the same identifier, one’s privacy is compromised (section 2.1, page 3). Nothing in RFC 3041 is seen to even remotely teach, suggest, or show the limitation of

determining whether a network address conforms to the identification data of a specific device as recited in independent Claim 1. Rather, RFC 3041 describes that one's privacy is compromised with the extended use of the same identifier.

Because RFC 2462 and RFC 3041 lack at least the above-noted features of the present invention, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of RFC 2462 and RFC 3041 fails to disclose each and every feature recited in Claim 1, and thus, the Office Action has failed to establish an adequate evidentiary basis to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C § 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent Claim 1 and indicate the claim as allowable at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Independent Claim 10 is directed to a memory for limiting data transfer, and was rejected for essentially the same reasons as Claim 1. As such, the arguments set forth above with respect to Claim 1 are applicable to Claim 10.

Claims 2-9 and 11-18 depend from at least one of allowable base claims 1 or 10 and/or are rejected for the same reasons. As such, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable at least for the reason that each of these claims depends from allowable base Claims 1 or 10 and/or are rejected for the same reasons and recite additional features that further define the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct or credit any underpayments or overpayments submitted in conjunction with this response from/to deposit account number **502456**.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the (949) 932-3329.

Respectfully submitted,

2/13/08

/Sivon Kalminov/

Date

Sivon Kalminov, Reg. No. 40,042
Attorney for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731
Fax: (949) 932-3560